

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
9

10 PACIFIC COAST STEEL, *et al.*,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 TODD LEE LEANY, *et al.*,

14 Defendants.
15

Case No. 2:09-CV-02190-KJD-PAL

ORDER

16 Presently before the Court is Defendants' Objection to Magistrate's Order (#97). Plaintiffs
17 filed a response in opposition (#99). Objections to the magistrate judge's Order (#93) were filed
18 pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-1 of the Local Rules of Practice of the United States District Court for
19 the District of Nevada.

20 Defendants are required to demonstrate that the magistrate judge's ruling is clearly erroneous
21 or contrary to law. The Court finds that the magistrate's Order (# 93) is neither clearly erroneous nor
22 contrary to law under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a). See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). This
23 Court does not have a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been made. See Weeks v.
24 Samsung Heavy Indus. Co. Ltd., 126 F.3d 926, 943 (7th Cir. 1997). Magistrate Judge Leen
25 adequately considered the scope of the subpoenas as to both time and entities covered. Furthermore,
26 the magistrate judge gave the appropriate level of scrutiny to the discovery sought in this action.

1 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants' Objections (#97) are **DENIED**;

2 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the magistrate judge's Order (#93) is **AFFIRMED**.

3 DATED this 21st day of January 2011.

4

5

6



Kent J. Dawson
United States District Judge

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26